

MASx52: Assignment 2

Solutions and discussion are written in blue. A sample mark scheme, with a total of 25 marks, is given in red, with each mark placed after the statement/deduction for which the mark would be given. As usual, mathematically correct solutions that follow a different method would be marked analogously.

1. Let (X_n) be a sequence of i.i.d. random variables, each with a uniform distribution on $[-1, 1]$. Define

$$S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i,$$

where $S_0 = 0$. Let $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$.

- (a) Show that S_n is a martingale, with respect to the filtration \mathcal{F}_n .
(b) Find $\mathbb{E}[S_3^2 | \mathcal{F}_2]$ in terms of X_2 and X_1 , and hence show that

$$\mathbb{E}[S_3^2 | \mathcal{F}_2] = S_2^2 + \frac{1}{3}.$$

- (c) Write down a deterministic function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$M_n = S_n^2 - f(n)$$

is a martingale (justification is not required – make a guess!).

Solution.

- (a) Since $X_i \in \sigma(X_i)$ we have $X_i \in \sigma\mathcal{F}_n$ for all $i \leq n$ [1]. Hence, since sums of \mathcal{F}_n measurable functions are measurable, we have also that $S_n \in \mathcal{F}_n$ [1].
Since $|X_i| \leq 1$ for all i , we have

$$|S_n| \leq |X_1| + |X_2| + \dots + |X_n| \leq n.$$

Thus S_n is a bounded random variable and hence $S_n \in L^1$. [1]

Lastly,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[S_{n+1} | \mathcal{F}_n] &= \mathbb{E}[X_{n+1} + S_n | \mathcal{F}_n] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[X_{n+1} | \mathcal{F}_n] + \mathbb{E}[S_n | \mathcal{F}_n] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[X_{n+1}] + S_n \\ &= S_n. \end{aligned}$$

[1] Here, we use the linearity of conditional expectation to deduce the second line, followed by using that X_{n+1} is independent of \mathcal{F}_n [1] and $S_n \in \mathcal{F}_n$ to deduce the third line [1]. The final line follows because $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = 0$ for all i . Hence S_n is a martingale.

Pitfall: You should justify your use of the rules of conditional expectation.

(b) We have

$$S_n^3 = (X_1 + X_2 + X_3)^2 = X_1^2 + X_2^2 + X_3^2 + 2X_1X_2 + 2X_2X_3 + 2X_1X_3.$$

[1] Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[S_3^2 | \mathcal{F}_2] &= \mathbb{E}[X_1^2 | \mathcal{F}_n] + \mathbb{E}[X_2^2 | \mathcal{F}_2] + \mathbb{E}[X_3^2 | \mathcal{F}_2] \\ &\quad + 2\mathbb{E}[X_1X_2 | \mathcal{F}_2] + 2\mathbb{E}[X_2X_3 | \mathcal{F}_2] + 2\mathbb{E}[X_1X_3 | \mathcal{F}_2] \\ &= X_1^2 + X_2^2 + \mathbb{E}[X_3^2] + 2X_1X_2 + 2X_2\mathbb{E}[X_3] + 2X_1\mathbb{E}[X_3] \\ &= (X_1 + X_2)^2 + \frac{1}{3} \\ &= S_2^2 + \frac{1}{3}.\end{aligned}$$

[1]. Here, in the first line we use linearity of conditional expectation. To deduce the second line we use that X_3 is independent of \mathcal{F}_2 [1], and that $X_1, X_2 \in m\mathcal{F}_2$ to ‘take out what is known’ [1]. We then use that

$$\mathbb{E}[X_3^2] = \int_{-1}^1 x^2 \frac{1}{2} dx = \frac{1}{3}$$

to deduce the final lines [1].

Pitfall: X_n has the *continuous* uniform distribution on the interval $[-1, 1]$.

(c) In view of (b), we take $f(n) = \frac{n}{3}$, so that $M_n = S_n - \frac{n}{3}$ [2].

To make this guess: note from (b) that $\mathbb{E}[S_n^2]$ drifts upwards by $\frac{1}{3}$ on each time step, so $\mathbb{E}[S_n^2 - \frac{n}{3}]$ stays constant. This is the only way to compensate for the drift in the form $S_n - f(n)$, and (possibly) obtain a martingale.

To see that M_n really is a martingale: Since $S_n \in \mathcal{F}_n$ we have $M_n \in \mathcal{F}_n$, and $|M_n| \leq |S_n| + \frac{2n}{3} \leq n^2 + \frac{n}{3}$ so $M_n \in L^1$. A similar calculation to (b) then shows that $\mathbb{E}[S_{n+1}^2 | \mathcal{F}_n] = S_n^2 + \frac{1}{3}$, hence $\mathbb{E}[M_{n+1} | \mathcal{F}_n] = M_n$.

2. Consider the one-period market with $r = \frac{1}{10}$, $s = 2$, $d = \frac{1}{2}$ and $u = 3$, in our usual notation. A contract specifies that

The holder of the contract will sell 2 units of stock, and be paid K units of cash, at time 1.

(a) Explain briefly why the contingent claim of this contract is

$$\Phi(S_1) = K - 2S_1.$$

(b) Find a replicating portfolio h for this contingent claim.

(c) Write down the value V_0^h of h at time 0.

(d) Find the numerical values of risk-neutral probabilities

$$q_u = \frac{(1+r) - d}{u - d} \quad \text{and} \quad q_d = \frac{u - (1+r)}{u - d}.$$

Hence, check that $\frac{1}{1+r}\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[\Phi(S_1)]$ and V_0^h have the same values.

- (e) For which K does the contract have value zero at time 0?

Solution.

- (a) The holder will be paid K units of cash, resulting in a gain of K , and give away 2 units of stock, each of which is worth S_1 , resulting in a loss of $2S_1$. [1] Hence

$$\Phi(S_1) = K - 2S_1.$$

Pitfall: This is not a European put option. The holder of this contract *must* pay K units of cash and be given 2 stock.

- (b) The possible values taken by S_1 are $su = 6$ and $sd = 1$. A replicating portfolio $h = (x, y)$ must satisfy $V_1^h = \Phi(S_1)$, [1] meaning that

$$\begin{aligned} (1 + \frac{1}{10})x + 6y &= K - 12 \\ (1 + \frac{1}{10})x + y &= K - 2 \end{aligned}$$

[2] We now solve these equations. Taking one away from the other, we obtain $5y = -10$, hence $y = -2$ which gives $x = \frac{K}{11/10} = \frac{10K}{11}$. [1]

- (c) The value of the contract is

$$V_0^h = x + sy = \frac{10K}{11} - 4$$

[1] at time 0.

- (d) The risk-neutral probabilities are

$$\begin{aligned} q_u &= \frac{11/10 - 1/2}{3 - 1/2} = \frac{3/5}{5/2} = \frac{6}{25}, \\ q_d &= \frac{3 - 11/10}{3 - 1/2} = \frac{19/10}{5/2} = \frac{19}{25}. \end{aligned}$$

[1] This gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{1+r} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[\Phi(S_1)] &= \frac{1}{11/10} \left(\frac{6}{25}(K - 12) + \frac{19}{25}(K - 2) \right) \\ &= \frac{10}{11} \left(K - \frac{110}{25} \right) \\ &= \frac{10K}{11} - 4, \end{aligned}$$

[2] which is equal to the value of V_0^h that we found in (c).

- (e) The contract is worth zero at time 0 if $\frac{10}{11}K - 4 = 0$, that is if $K = \frac{22}{5}$. [1]